



T. 01453 754331

F. 01453 754957

democratic.services@stroud.gov.uk

Council Offices, Ebley Mill, Stroud, Gloucestershire. GL5 4UB

**CABINET****9 December 2010****10.30 am – 1.20 pm****Council Chamber, Ebley Mill, Stroud****Minutes****3****Membership:**

Frances Roden	Chair of Cabinet (Leader of Council)	P
Keith Pearson	Regeneration Portfolio (Deputy Leader)	P
Joe Forbes	Community Services Portfolio	P
Elisabeth Bird	Climate Change Portfolio	P
Nigel Cooper	Finance Portfolio	P
Barbara Tait	Planning and Environment Portfolio	P
Debbie Young	Housing Portfolio	P

P = Present

A = Absent

**Other Councillors in attendance**

Dennis Andrewartha	Harry Carr	Brian Marsh
Gwen Belcher	June Cordwell	Ken Stephens
Philip Bevan	Daniel Le Fleming	

**Officers in attendance**

Chief Executive	Planning Strategy Manager
Strategic Head (Development Services)	Principal Human Resources Officer
Strategic Head (Tenant Services)	Principal Marketing Officer
Strategic Head (Customer Services)	Supported Housing Manager
Head of Corporate Resources	Business Accountant (HRA)
Head of Asset Management	Consultant (Woolaways/HRA Asset Strategy)
Head of Finance/Section 151 Officer	Housing Strategy and Enabling Officer
Legal Services Manager	Senior Democratic Services & Elections Officer
Policy Implementation Manager – Planning Housing and Regeneration	

**Others Present**

Mr Hugh Inwood from theresearchbox  
 Mr Mike Maxwell, Mrs Pauline Simpson, Mr James W.F. Simpson and  
 Mr John Hatton sheltered housing residents who had submitted questions.

**CBT.053**            **APOLOGIES**

There were none.

**CBT.054**            **DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

**(a) Personal and Prejudicial Interests**

There were none.

**(b) Section 106 of the Local Government Finance Act 1992**

There were none.

**CBT.055**            **MINUTES**

The Leader proposed two amendments to the minutes, which were duly seconded, namely CBT.042, in the penultimate paragraph headed Wotton Pool, the deletion of the words "from the Mayor of Wotton-under-Edge" on the second line and also the deletion of the words "had the lease on" replaced with the word "own" in the last sentence.

**RESOLVED**            **That the Minutes of the Cabinet meeting held on 30 September 2010 are approved as a correct record and signed by the Chair, subject to the above amendments.**

The Leader announced a change to the published Agenda. After Agenda Item 5 - Budget Residents Survey Consultation Results, public questions would be taken and then Agenda Item 11 - Sheltered Housing Review report would be taken. The Agenda would run in chronological order from Agenda Item 6 onwards.

Prior to the business of the meeting the Leader requested that all present be standing for one minute to think of Councillor Linda Townley, who had recently passed away.

In accordance with the provisions of Section 100B 4(b) of the Local Government Act 1972, the Leader agreed that the addendum report relating to the Sheltered Housing Review item be added to the published agenda on the basis of the results of further consultation undertaken since the Agenda was published. Copies of the addendum had been circulated to Cabinet and were available along with other meeting papers.

**CBT.056**            **BUDGET RESIDENTS SURVEY CONSULTATION RESULTS**

The Leader invited Hugh Inwood from theresearchbox to give a powerpoint presentation on the annual survey of 300 residents and 200 businesses to ascertain trends on satisfaction. The results are then fed into the budget making process. A full report was available and the presentation would be published on the Council's website.

**RESOLVED**            **To use the surveys to inform budget options and future policy development and note the improved public satisfaction with the Council.**

**CBT.057****PUBLIC QUESTION TIME**

The following questions were received from **Mr Mike Maxwell of 24 Grangeview, Uplands, Stroud, Glos** and submitted to and answered by the **Cabinet Member for Housing**, as set out below.

**Question**

1. The framing of the proposal around Option 2 which in effect is a 5<sup>th</sup> option which has not formed part of the consultation with sheltered tenants or the 14 members and small proportion of general needs tenants who attended the very costly TPAS consultations - Why is this 5<sup>th</sup> option considered to be "compatible with the findings of the TPAS consultations?

**Response**

The recommendation is framed around Option 2 because it creates a series of linked schemes in which each Scheme Manager would cover two schemes. This is the structure set out in Option 2. The number of schemes where this would apply is now greater than that set out in the Review Consultation Document. This change and the reasons for it have been set out in the report to Council. The proposals now being made were set out in the presentation to USAP on 25 November and Housing Management Forum on 29 November. A leaflet was issued to all scheme residents on 25 November 2010 which set out the proposed linkages and invited further comments. Further comments received are being reported to Cabinet and Council to be taken into account in any decision making.

**Supplementary Question**

The wisdom of twinning of Ashwell House, Painswick with Grove Park Road, Uplands and is it not true that the proposals of the links will give tenants less than half service when you take into account the amount of travelling time?

**Response**

A written response will be given as soon as possible, prior to the meeting of full Council.

2. The initial consultations by the Independent Tenant Advisors – TPAS – were inconsistent in terms of Options offered to tenants and subsequently flawed – Why is such a major part of this discussion paper i.e. 45 pages given such prominence and yet the findings e.g., 72% of tenants wish to retain a resident scheme manager ignored in the recommendation?

The Review Consultation Document set out a range of options and TPAS, as the independent tenant advisor, consulted upon all these options. The TPAS report clearly states that 72% of residents who expressed an option supported Option 1 [Section 4, page 21 – 22]. The report to Cabinet also states this [at paragraph 6.3 page 10]. This has also been clearly stated in the presentation given to HMF, Scrutiny and Cabinet. The expressed views of residents will be taken into account together with the Council's duties to balance its finances, its need to attract external funding such as Supporting People, the need to manage its services efficiently, the needs of people in the wider community and the duty to secure value for money.

**Supplementary Question**

How many tenders were sought for the consultation ie TPAS, how many others were approached and how were TPAS engaged?

**Response**

A written response will be given as soon as possible, prior to the meeting of full Council.

3. Why was TPAS appointed as an Independent Tenant Advisor against the wishes of the tenant body USAP at a cost of £53K and the findings of their consultations totally ignored in the recommendation – was this best use of Public Funds i.e. the Housing Revenue Account?

The Review Project Board decided to appoint an independent tenant advisor in order to ensure that an independent source of information and advice was made available from outside of the Council. The findings of the consultation are set out in the report to Cabinet and will be taken into account in the decision made at Council.

**Supplementary Question**

How could this possibly be an independent body when senior Stroud District Council officers attended the consultations?

**Response**

A written response will be given as soon as possible, prior to the meeting of full Council.

Prior to asking her questions Mrs Simpson expressed her concern that she had only just had sight of the addendum and had not had time to prepare.

The following questions were received from **Mrs Pauline Simpson of 51 Dryleaze Court Wotton-under-Edge, Glos** and submitted to and answered by the **Cabinet Member for Housing**, as set out below.

**Questions**

1. It is stated in the discussion paper and in various press releases that there will be no redundancies and that the current permanent staff levels will be accommodated in the proposal being put forward. However, the facts are that the permanent Residential Scheme Manager staff complement has been reduced over the past 3 years to 18 heads; the full staff complement of 29 heads has been supplemented by employing non-permanent agency staff. The proposal put forward represents a significant reduction in staff of 38%. The Government recommendation to Local Authorities is a 10% reduction in staff – why would SDC concentrate its cuts on the most vulnerable in its society?"

**Responses**

The current number of Resident and Visiting Scheme Manager roles is 32. The recommendations now being made would create an additional Visiting Scheme Manager, employ an officer to promote and develop hub and spoke and replace part time hours with full time contracts. When account is taken of these improvements the number of posts in the new structure would be 23 full time equivalents, rather than 25 full time equivalents as at present. This is a reduction of 6.6% in housing support hours. This calculation takes into account the proposal in the addendum report for the retention of separate scheme managers in Concord and Ringfield in Nailsworth and Glebelands and Springfields in Cam.

**Supplementary Question**

I was talking about Scheme Managers and did not ask about hours and the fact remains we have something like 9 agency staff who are working the hours

**Response**

A written response will be given as soon as possible, prior to the meeting of full Council.

that were there previously for the Scheme Managers so I perceive that it is a reduction in staff of 9 and my reduction of 38% stands?

2. The timescale for tenants to read and respond to this 180 page document was inadequate, in the HMF terms of reference, agreed by tenants, councillors and officers two weeks should have been allowed – 5 working days including a weekend was the time given, furthermore, there are a number of reports that have been carried out by various consultants and the Project Team that are not included in this discussion paper; in addition Option D/4 put forward by tenant representatives at HMF 2<sup>nd</sup> March 2010 which recognised the lack of capacity and sustainability to operate the Hub and Spoke model put forward in Option B/2 as the preferred option of the Project Team and which stated that further work needed to be carried out on the proposal and it was agreed that a meeting was to be convened to progress that option, never transpired, moreover, Option D/4 was incorrectly/inadequately portrayed in the TPAS documentation that was circulated and therefore the full facts have not been put forward in order that all parties are fully informed– in light of the foregoing is Cabinet comfortable that due process has been followed in coming to its recommendation to Council?

#### **Supplementary Question**

Is Cabinet comfortable that all relevant information has been provided in order for Members to make an informed decision. There is no evidence in the report of cost savings in the proposal or how much has been spent on the review in the last 3 years, 9 months. I would really like to see this?

3. Is this proposal pre-emptive of the final strategy by Supporting People (SP) and is cabinet convinced that the proposal put forward has the capability and sustainability to facilitate the Hub and Spoke model which is a pre-

It was agreed that a special Council meeting be held on this matter on 16 December and that, before then, the review be considered by HMF, Scrutiny and Cabinet. The timetable for the publication is papers determined by standing orders and the dates of meetings set by the Council Calendar. The report was published at the point that papers had to be issued to Scrutiny Members. This ensured that all parties, including tenants, received information at the same time as each other. The report itself is 16 pages long with the other material published as appendices. A short leaflet in question and answer format has been issued to all scheme residents. Additional background material, including papers previously reported to the Project Board, has been made available. In relation to Option 4, this option has been analysed and appraised within the Review Consultation Document. A letter of clarification was issued by TPAS with regard to Option 4 which is reproduced at Appendix D to the TPAS report.

#### **Response**

The Leader said whilst Cabinet were debating the report individual views would become clear.

A written response will be given as soon as possible, prior to the meeting of full Council.

The draft Supporting People Strategy 2011 – 16 has been considered and the section within it on older people's services appears at Appendix C. It is clear from this that, whilst no final decisions have been taken, Supporting People will be looking to

requisite of SP funding in their Draft Strategy report, in addition where is the evidence to show that there is a contingency plan in the event that SP funding is drastically reduced?

commission services that are delivered more flexibly and are targeted towards those in need of support, rather than being provided to sheltered housing residents only. Recommendation 6 is that a report be produced on the position if Supporting People funding changes in such a way as to create uncertainty about the long term financing for the service.

#### **Supplementary Question**

Why would Stroud District Council cut so deep and so drastically, where is the evidence of the cost savings in the proposed option versus the costs of the 3 year 9 month review and the lack of information on the finalisation of supporting people report.

#### **Response**

A written response will be given as soon as possible, prior to the meeting of full Council.

The following questions were received from **Mr James W.F. Simpson of 51 Dryleaze Court, Wotton-under-Edge, Glos** and submitted to and answered by the **Cabinet Member for Housing**, as set out below.

1. It appears from the Agenda dated 3<sup>rd</sup> December 2010 received 4<sup>th</sup> December 2010 for the Council Extraordinary meeting of Thursday 16<sup>th</sup> December 2010 that Cabinet has already recommended to Council its decision from the Cabinet meeting of Thursday 9<sup>th</sup> December 2010 and why would Cabinet approve and recommend the sheltered housing service be framed around Option 2 when key elements of the service delivery to the over 60's in the wider community via the Hub and Spoke model have not yet been clarified i.e. what service is to be delivered; what would these tenants be prepared to pay for this service; and what evidence is there that the recommended 22 twinned schemes because of their size have the capacity to deliver the service or whether the 11 scheme managers concerned have the capability to market the service?

The Cabinet papers contain a proposal to be put before Council. No decisions will be made until Council. The services to be delivered through a hub and spoke model including support visits being provided to people in the wider community and access to scheme managers by people from the wider community coming into schemes. This model of working proved successful in one recent pilot scheme [Cashes Green] which attracted 19 local residents who were supported by the Scheme Manager together with the 16 residents of the scheme. We have undertaken an assessment of the capacity that would exist if the recommendations were implemented. This suggests that taking into account the size of schemes, and the levels of support required, there would be capacity for the service as shaped by these recommendations to provide support to approximately 300 people who do not live in sheltered housing.

#### **Supplementary Question**

What service would be delivered and what would tenants be prepared to pay for? What revenue would be generated in Cashes Green?

#### **Response**

A written response will be given as soon as possible, prior to the meeting of full Council.

2. Why would Cabinet ignore the total lack of evidence in the paper relating to the feasibility or a business plan of the Hub and Spoke model?

The financial implications of the recommendations are not reliant upon any additional income from the provision of services to people in the wider community. The recommendations can be funded as set out in the report. The capacity of the service will be assessed in each locality and outreach work built up over time. Any future proposed expenditure, which would be viable only if supported by additional income, would be subject to rigorous appraisal and business planning.

#### **Supplementary Question**

The proposed twinning has been changed numerous times, what would be the impact on the Council's Scheme Managers?

3. Why would Cabinet ignore the overall extremely high risk associated with the proposed massive change to the service to be implemented by 01.04.2011 without any concrete evidence of what funding will be available from Supporting People and whether or not a contingency plan for alternative funding has been prepared in this pre-emptive proposal?

#### **Response**

A written response will be given as soon as possible, prior to the meeting of full Council.

As explained in response to an earlier question it is abundantly clear that Supporting People will not continue to fund the service as it currently operates. It is important to note that Stroud District Council is alone in Gloucestershire in maintaining resident scheme manager cover across its service. The draft Supporting People Strategy states that there are people in sheltered housing who do not need housing related support services. It proposes that the model for what it funds be changed so that access and eligibility arrangements for support services should be separated from access arrangements to housing specifically designed as being suitable for older people. This means that automatic funding will not be available from Supporting People for all scheme residents. The recommendations enable the service to prepare for a future in which the service will need to be organised more flexibly so that the resources employed relate more closely to the need for housing support. It is desirable to begin to take these steps now in order to respond to future Supporting People changes in a managed, controlled and planned way. As stated previously [recommendation 6 is that] a report will be produced on the position if Supporting People funding changes in such a way as to create uncertainty about the long term financing for the service.

**Supplementary Question**

Why is the Council decimating a Scheme Manager Service that won an award in 2004/05?

**Response**

A written response will be given as soon as possible, prior to the meeting of full Council.

The following questions were received from **Mr John Hatton of 20 Concord, Nailsworth, Glos GL6 0DQ** and submitted to and answered by the **Cabinet Member for Housing**, as set out below.

1. Would Cabinet agree that the provision of services for the vulnerable elderly cannot be judged by the same profit and loss balance sheet as one would use for considering viability of a sweet shop, and that therefore much of the 160 supporting pages to the Sheltered Housing Review is irrelevant and misleading?"

All social housing services provide support to people who would otherwise not have their needs fully met in the housing market including many who can be defined as vulnerable. We are mindful that 15% of sheltered housing residents are people with Personal Care Packages. It should be noted, however, that there are others who have less need and may, indeed, be assessed as having no housing support needs. There is a duty to seek to balance the Housing Revenue Account, which funds the deficit in respect of sheltered housing, and to close the funding gap so that the service can be sustained in the future.

**Supplementary Question**

From the survey results we have just listened to local people are willing to pay more for services – Yes or No?

**Response**

A written response will be given as soon as possible, prior to the meeting of full Council.

2. Would Cabinet agree that when the agency manager for Concord says that she is having difficulty in fulfilling all essential tasks in a full working day, it is not feasible to combine Concord with another scheme for managerial purposes without substantial diminution in quality of services, and that this may be evidenced in the fact that she is unable to progress essential repairs to tenants' flats?

It would be inappropriate to have a public discussion of comments purportedly made by employees or agency managers as reported by a third party. Comments on capacity have, however, been made in responses to consultation on this report. These have been considered and are reflected in the matters being put to Cabinet.

**Supplementary Question**

Are Cabinet Members aware that Scheme Managers have just been given a new task to report repairs, they are being given more work and less time to do it in.

**Response**

A written response will be given as soon as possible, prior to the meeting of full Council.

3. Would Cabinet agree that the remarks of its "independent" consultants about misleading publicity, by which presumably it means publications produced by me, show that TPAS was never truly

The report from TPAS is the product of the independent tenant advisors and not of the Council. The opinions expressed in the report on the conduct of the review process are those of TPAS. Their report incorporates feedback on overall satisfaction with the

independent, when the results of this review have proved every word I wrote about the threat to services?

TPAS team – with 93% saying that they found them to be excellent, good or satisfactory and only 7% regarding TPAS as being poor or very poor.

#### **Supplementary Question**

Regarding USAP being involved in the review, USAP had been invited to only one set of discussions – so the Council will impose its will.

#### **Response**

A written response will be given as soon as possible, prior to the meeting of full Council.

### **CBT.058**

### **REVIEW OF SHELTERED HOUSING**

The Cabinet Member for Housing invited the Sheltered Housing Manager to make a powerpoint presentation which had been updated for Cabinet following feedback being given by the Special Housing Management Forum and Strategic Overview and Scrutiny Committee. He highlighted changes to the preferred option 2, contained within the addendum to the report that had been circulated prior to the meeting.

The Cabinet Member for Housing confirmed that following these discussions and those with Stroud Older Peoples Forum new linkages were being proposed, with a deficit of an additional cost of £30k, giving a housing support deficit totalling £129,459. Additional information on outreach services was provided on page 4 of the addendum and a summary of advantages and disadvantages of options for change was shown on page 5.

The Leader was most concerned to hear that there were repairs needed at Concord and requested that the matter be progressed.

During debate the following points were clarified:-

- If a member of staff were currently on secondment then their post would be looked at in line with Council policy.
- If the Scheme Manager was on duty they would deal with all emergencies but if they were off site these would be dealt with by Hereford who would make contact with the appropriate emergency contact.
- There is a need to reach older people within the community, especially the people who are living around the vicinity of a sheltered scheme.
- More support needed to be given to older vulnerable and frail people.
- The proposed provision of 4 extra sheltered housing schemes, making a total of 6 within the Council's district are required because of the aging population requiring additional support.
- Care packages are supplied by a third party.
- The review had taken 4 years and was originally undertaken as a review of the operation, finances do play a part, but it had nothing to do with the comprehensive spending review.
- The review originally aimed at providing a better sheltered housing service but unfortunately due to changes to the supporting people subsidy, which will reduce or cease, the HRA cannot afford to subsidise tenants to the same extent.
- The status quo is not an option.
- The Audit Commission's advice and guidance recommended the Council provide a better and more efficient service, finance did not originally come into it.

- Individual care packages need to be given to individuals who currently do not receive any assistance outside of sheltered housing.
- Some time in the future the eligibility of older people moving into sheltered accommodation will be addressed.
- Since the despatch of Cabinet papers there had been many meetings and discussions and for clarity prior to the meeting of full Council all Members would be notified of what documents they need to bring with them to the meeting and also what they should have read beforehand.
- Concern was raised that the strategy was good but for extra sheltered housing there was no business plan and would this pose a risk?
- Members congratulated Officers in Housing for the huge amount of work that had been undertaken to bring the review to this stage, retaining Scheme Managers and finding a way forward. Hopefully the service would be expanded to the needy and vulnerable in the community.
- From 1 April 2011 there may be less funding from Supporting People and changes would be implemented gradually.
- Until Council has given approval a business plan cannot be firmed up.
- Option 2 preferred had been set out in the report but it was clear from the outcome of meetings that the linking of schemes had to be reviewed and these concerns resulted in the addendum to the original report.

The Leader proposed an amendment to the decision box to the report to reflect the Addendum report by adding the following words to paragraph 2. ... Appendix A, "as revised by the addendum report", which was duly seconded.

- RECOMMENDED TO COUNCIL**
- 1. The sheltered housing service be framed around Option 2 – this option being compatible with the findings of the consultation with tenants, staff, councillors and other parties and subsequent developments in funding prospects under the Comprehensive Spending Review and the emerging Supporting People Strategy.**
  - 2. The introduction of a 'Hub and Spoke' approach covering the schemes in Appendix A, as revised by the addendum report, whilst also extending support for older people in the community.**
  - 3. Provision of extra sheltered housing at the schemes in Appendix B subject to negotiation and consultation with Supporting People.**
  - 4. Enhancement of the Visiting Scheme Manager service as set out in paragraph 8.6 of this report.**
  - 5. The changes to the sheltered housing service be introduced from 1<sup>st</sup> April 2011 using a phased approach and adopting systems thinking as determined by the Strategic Head (Tenant Services) where this is in the best interests of the tenants and staff.**
  - 6. A further report be brought to Cabinet should the nature and scale of Supporting People funding change in such a way as to create uncertainty about long term financing for the service.**

The meeting adjourned at 12.15 pm and reconvened at 12.25 pm.

**CBT.059****HOUSING ASSET MANAGEMENT STRATEGY**

The Cabinet Member for Housing provided an update on progress on dealing with decision making on HRA assets and sought approval of the HRA Asset Management Strategy. She thanked the Task and Finish Group for their input.

During discussion it was confirmed that there were 3 tenants in Hazel Court and all of the tenants of Nos.13-18 School Road would need decanting prior to works being carried out to these properties.

**RESOLVED**

1. That the Housing Asset Management Strategy is approved.
2. That the current position in relation to development of the annual action plan for housing asset management is noted.
3. That the Council's Decanting Policy applies with immediate effect to the tenants of Hazel Court, Thrupp and 13-18 School Road, Dursley and decanting of these properties begins as soon as possible.
4. That subject to a restrictive covenant being lifted, 2 Cleeve House, Brimscombe is disposed of on the open market on terms to be agreed by the Head of Asset Management in consultation with the Head of Tenant Services and the Cabinet Member for Housing.
5. That future capital receipts from disposals of HRA assets will, as a general principle, be applied to the provision of affordable housing or regeneration, subject to Secretary of State approval under the Local Government (Capital Finance and Accounting) (England) Regulations 2003 on each case.

**CBT.060****WOOLAWAY PROPERTIES, MINCHINHAMPTON**

The Cabinet Member for Housing updated Members on the position regarding the Woolaway properties at Old Common and The Tynings, Minchinhampton and sought approval in principle to making budgetary provision for achieving redevelopment of the sites. Although not always visible the properties were well below standard and no longer fit for purpose. Tenants accept that it is not viable to repair their homes.

Tenants have expressed the wish to remain with the Council as landlord and will be able to move back into new build properties once these have been completed. The size of the properties offered to those wishing to return to Minchinhampton will be the subject of housing need. On both sites there are currently 40 homes and when these have been developed the density will be increased. There are 5 homes that had been purchased under the Council's Right to Buy Scheme. It is hoped that ground works for the redevelopment will begin during the summer of 2011.

The Cabinet Member for Housing wished to take the opportunity to thank Steve Abbott for all of his hard work on the Housing Asset Strategy and bringing the Woolaways to a satisfactory conclusion.

- RESOLVED**
1. To note the current position in relation to decanting of the sites.
  2. To approve the proposed approach for achieving redevelopment of the sites, including a commitment in principle to provide funding of up to £0.4m for a scheme to provide 35 new build Council homes to rent.
  3. To authorise the Strategic Head of Tenant Services in consultation with the Cabinet Holder for Housing to take forward arrangements for procuring the scheme with a view to a further report being brought to Cabinet early in the New Year.

**CBT.061**                      **LAND AT FOUNTAIN CRESCENT, WOTTON-UNDER-EDGE**

The Cabinet Member for Housing sought approval for the transfer of Council-owned land at Wotton-under-Edge to a developer. The land has a potential development site behind it and various negotiations had been undertaken over the past 14 years. A developer wished to build 14 houses upon the site which included 3 affordable houses.

Councillor June Cordwell, Ward Councillor welcomed the development, especially the 3 affordable homes. In the past the piece of land had attracted instances of anti-social behaviour and this would stop.

- RESOLVED**                      **To transfer land at Fountain Crescent, Wotton Under Edge (shown on the plan at Appendix 1 to the report) in return for the freehold of three completed dwellings on the new development on terms to be agreed by the Head of Asset Management in consultation with the Head of Tenant Services and Cabinet Member for Housing.**

**CBT.062**                      **ADOPTION OF SHORELINE MANAGEMENT PLAN (SMP2)**

The Cabinet Member for Planning and Environment outlined the above report which set out the recommended response to the Severn Estuary Coastal Group. The SMP2 is a non-statutory document and contained proposals on how the shoreline around the Severn Estuary could be managed over the next 100 years, taking many factors into account, including coastal erosion and flooding.

- RESOLVED**                      **That the Shoreline Management Plan 2 be adopted.**

**CBT.063**                      **USE OF COMPULSORY PURCHASE ORDER POWERS TO ACQUIRE LAND AT CAPELS MILL, STROUD TO DELIVER THE COTSWOLD CANALS RESTORATION**

The Cabinet Member for Regeneration introduced the report which sought Cabinet approval for the Council to use compulsory purchase powers to secure a plot of land, shown hatched in Appendix A to the report, to deliver the Cotswold Canal Restoration Project. The land is required for access under the viaduct but the owner is unknown. A complex legal process has to be followed to acquire this land which may, if no owner is found, become the Council's.

- RESOLVED**
1. That the Council compulsorily purchases the following sites under Section 226 (1)(a) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.
    - a. Capels Mill, Stroud
  2. That the compulsory acquisition be the subject of one or more orders, as determined by the Canal Project Manager.
  3. That the Canal Project Manager be granted delegated authority to amend the area of land shown on the plans, should the need arise, in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Regeneration, Chief Executive, the Head of Finance, the Head of Asset Management and the Legal Services Manager.

**CBT.64**                      **HOUSING IMPROVEMENT PLAN**

The Cabinet Member for Housing provided an update from her last report to Cabinet on the Housing Improvement Plan (HIP). By the end of October more than 90% of the action points had been partly or wholly addressed with 17 fully completed. All outstanding matters are scheduled to receive attention within the next 3 months.

The outcome of a follow up meeting with the TSA on 4 November 2010 was very positive, with another meeting planned on 11 February 2011. The TSA did not feel that an inspection was required because of the ongoing commitment throughout the Council on the HIP. A contingency plan will be put in place and reviewed on a regular basis in regard to staff leaving the Council's employ.

- RESOLVED**                      **To note the progress being made in developing and implementing the improvement plan.**

**CBT.065**                      **RISK MANAGEMENT AND REVIEW OF CORPORATE RISK REGISTER**

The Cabinet Member for Finance provided an update on the implementation of the new Risk Management Strategy and the risks identified on the Corporate Risk Register. Training will be offered to all Members, in addition to Scrutiny and Audit Committee Members. At present there are a few 'high risks' recorded which suggested that risks are being effectively managed.

- RESOLVED**                      **To note the progress made to date with implementing the Risk Management Strategy and the risks identified in the Corporate Risk Register.**

**CBT.066**                      **CORE STRATEGY – ALTERNATIVE STRATEGIES CONSULTATION RESPONSE**

The Cabinet Member for Planning and Environment provided an update on the outcome of the public consultation on the Alternative Strategies stage of the Core Strategy preparation. This would provide information to facilitate discussion on these matters in order to steer the work of Officers who would later present formal recommendations to Cabinet. Following consultation 14,700 responses were analysed which resulted in the most favoured options being, A, D and B.

- RESOLVED**                      **To note the report.**

**CBT.067****CANAL REGENERATION PROJECT**

The Cabinet Member for Regeneration presented the Canal Regeneration Project report and updated members on progress to date, which included:-

- The Risk Register remains the same
- A couple of projects are about to be finalised with the costs coming in just below budget.
- The bad weather had caused works at Upper Mills bridge and Ryeford Double Lock to slightly slip.
- Because of flooding issues there had been delays on the A46 bridge, but the diversion is working well and making little difference to the flow of traffic.
- Brimscombe Port (Phase B) is getting to a crucial stage where we are working to get the best out of the development and it is hoped to be working with a developer in the summer.
- The project is running smoothly and the project is receiving good press coverage.
- A lot of support from members of the public was given to the open days at Ryeford double lock and Upper Mills bridge.
- There had been a vast improvement on the tow path by Ebley Wharf.
- It is hoped that the canal between Ocean and Ebley Wharf will be opened during next autumn.
- The dredging of Ryeford Lock is due to commence on 10 January 2011.
- People are becoming more interested in the canal and its restoration and there had been an increase of people helping the Cotswold Canal Trust and REACH.
- No outside businesses had currently expressed an interest to create any employment opportunities.
- Additional funding for the shortfall was still being pursued.
- Information regarding a hydro scheme would be sought.

**RESOLVED****To note the report.****CBT.068****LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT 2000 – URGENT ITEMS**

There were none.

The Leader confirmed that a Special Meeting of Cabinet would be taking place at 10.30 am on Thursday, 6 January 2011 in the Council Chamber. She took the opportunity to thank everyone for all for their hard work from behind the scenes.

The meeting closed at 1.20 pm.

**Chair**